

REMARKS

This is responsive to the office action dated May 17, 2006. The examiner has rejected all of the claims over Yang in view of Go. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection with respect to the claims as amended.

All of the claims, in one form or another, now call for the two step process set forth in applicant's specification. Specifically, applicant's specification incorporates provisional application no 60/446.596 by reference, and includes it as an appendix. Equations 1-6 of that provisional set forth a process by which vectors are formed from amplitude projections, the vectors are then normalized, and the normalized vectors are then concatenated and again the result normalized to form what applicant calls the DFA vector. This specific processing of the information to form two different sets of vectors is set forth, for example, in claim 10 as "and wherein said DFA is derived by utilizing the amplitude projections along rows and columns of said images to form a plurality of vectors, normalizing said plurality of vectors, concatenating all of the normalized vectors, and then normalizing the combined vectors."

In the prior Action of November 28, 2005, the Examiner noted that "[I]f applicant does not recite the DFA vector more specifically, the examiner will hold his rejections to Claims...". The "DFA vector" of Yang and Go are different from the DFA vector of the present invention. It appears that the Examiner recognized the difference in the derivation of the vectors, but did not believe such difference was adequately pointed out in the claims. While applicant respectfully disagrees, the claims have nonetheless been further amended to clearly point out this two step processing of vectors.

The present amendment distinguishes the claims from Go and Yang because neither reference describes the use of a plurality of vectors which are normalized and concatenated to produce a vector which is then itself normalized and used for face detection. Even the latest Office Action merely notes that Yang uses amplitude projections for face recognition, a far cry from the detailed limitations of the multistep vector concatenation and normalization process set forth in the claims.

As neither Yang nor Go discloses the invention as presently claimed, the claims now comply with the Examiner's prior request to specify the actual algorithm for deriving applicant's unique vector, and thus, should be allowed.

Conclusion:

The applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and allowance in view of the above remarks and amendments. The Examiner is authorized to deduct any fees believed due from our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully submitted,

KAPLAN GILMAN GIBSON & DERNIER LLP
900 Route 9 North, Suite 504
Woodbridge, New Jersey 07095
Telephone (732) 614-7634

Dated: August 16, 2006


Jeffrey P. Kaplan
Reg. No. 34,356